

# **EXHIBIT 3**

CLEMENT SETH ROBERTS (STATE BAR NO. 209203)  
croberts@orrick.com  
BAS DE BLANK (STATE BAR NO. 191487)  
basdeblank@orrick.com  
ALYSSA CARIDIS (STATE BAR NO. 260103)  
acaridis@orrick.com  
EVAN D. BREWER (STATE BAR NO. 304411)  
ebrewer@orrick.com  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
The Orrick Building  
405 Howard Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105-2669  
Telephone: +1 415 773 5700  
Facsimile: +1 415 773 5759

SEAN M. SULLIVAN (*pro hac vice*)  
sullivan@ls3ip.com  
COLE RICHTER (*pro hac vice*)  
richter@ls3ip.com  
LEE SULLIVAN SHEA & SMITH LLP  
656 W Randolph St., Floor 5W  
Chicago, IL 60661  
Telephone: +1 312 754 0002  
Facsimile: +1 312 754 0003

*Attorneys for Defendant Sonos, Inc.*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

GOOGLE LLC,  
  
Plaintiff and Counter-defendant,  
  
v.  
  
SONOS, INC.,  
  
Defendant and Counter-claimant.

Case No. 3:20-cv-06754-WHA  
Related to Case No. 3:21-cv-07559-WHA

**OPENING EXPERT REPORT OF  
DR. KEVIN C. ALMEROOTH**

1 with an overlapping Accused Google Player, Mr. Shekel stated that “obviously [Google] wouldn’t  
2 want the user to be prevented from this scenario, especially since it is fully supported.” *See*  
3 GOOG-SONOS-NDCA-00114286-301 at 286.

4 773. As another example, take, for instance, a user who is enjoying and wants to  
5 continue listening to synchronous audio on a first “speaker group” that has previously been  
6 launched at the time the user decides to set up a second “speaker group” for use at some later time,  
7 where the second “speaker group” includes one or more of the Accused Google Players in the first  
8 “speaker group.” Although not clear from Google’s limited description of its third purported non-  
9 infringing alternative, in this example, it appears that upon setting up the second “speaker group”  
10 either (i) the one or more overlapping Accused Google Players would stop playing the audio they  
11 were playing in accordance with the first “speaker group” and the remaining Accused Google  
12 Speakers in the first “speaker group” would continue playing the audio they were playing in  
13 accordance with the first “speaker group” or (ii) all of the Accused Google Speakers in the first  
14 “speaker group” would stop playing audio. In my opinion, neither of these results is commercially  
15 acceptable because they each result in one or more of the Accused Google Speakers in the first  
16 “speaker group” stopping playback despite the fact that the user wanted to continue listing to  
17 synchronous audio on the first “speaker group.”

18 774. Notably, Mr. Shekel also confirmed that Google’s third purported non-infringing  
19 alternative would not be commercially acceptable in this regard as well. Specifically, Mr. Shekel  
20 testified that “if by setting a group you’ll now be stopping the music a person played [on an  
21 Accused Google Player then] that would *not be a great experience* for that user.” *See* 11/23/2022  
22 T. Shekel Dep. Tr. at 99:9-16 (Q: “Would you say that it’s an important feature for the music  
23 playback [on Accused Google Players] to not be disturbed while you set up new groups?” A: In  
24 my opinion, if by setting a group you’ll now be stopping the music a person played that would not  
25 be a great experience for that user.”).

26 775. Further, I understand that Google has been providing users with the ability to listen  
27 to synchronous audio on a first “speaker group” that has previously been launched at the time the  
28 user decides to create and save a second “speaker group” that includes one or more of the Accused

1 Google Players in the first “speaker group,” and to continue listening to the synchronous audio on  
2 the first “speaker group” after the second “speaker group” has been created and saved since at least  
3 as early as December 2015. *See, e.g.*, SONOS-SVG2-00040246-49; 5/10/2022 K. MacKay Dep.  
4 Tr. at 260:21-263:20 (testifying that Google began developing its “static” speaker group  
5 functionality in “March of 2015”). Thus, at the time Google would have allegedly implemented  
6 its third purported non-infringing alternative some four to five years later in November 2019 and/or  
7 November 2020 (when the ’966 Patent and ’885 Patent issued, respectively), Google’s customers  
8 would have been accustomed to being able to create and save a new “speaker group” that includes  
9 one or more Accused Google Players that are already members of a previously created and  
10 launched “speaker group” without interrupting the synchronous playback on the previously created  
11 and launched “speaker group.” In my opinion, this further confirms that Google’s third purported  
12 non-infringing alternative would not have been commercially acceptable.

13 776. Further yet, during a discussion with Mr. Nick Millington, who is Sonos’s Chief  
14 Innovation Officer, I asked Mr. Millington for his thoughts regarding a hypothetical change to the  
15 design of Sonos’s “saved groups” feature whereby it would no longer be possible to have multiple  
16 saved groups that included the same Sonos player. In response, Mr. Millington indicated that he  
17 did not believe Sonos’s customers would consider this to be an acceptable change to Sonos’s  
18 “saved groups” feature for similar reasons to those summarized above. Mr. Millington also  
19 pointed out that removing the ability to have multiple saved groups that included the same Sonos  
20 player would eliminate one of the key benefits of Sonos’s “saved groups” feature relative to  
21 Sonos’s ad-hoc grouping feature that allows groups of Sonos players to be created and invoked on  
22 the fly.

23 777. Lastly, Google also has not established that this third purported non-infringing  
24 alternative, which was not on the market during the timeframe of infringement, would have been  
25 available to Google – particularly in view of the fact that Sonos has many other patents directed to  
26 technology for grouping “zone players” together for synchronous playback.

27 **XVII. SONOS’S USE OF THE PATENTED TECHNOLOGY**

28 778. I have been asked to evaluate and provide my opinions regarding whether any of

1           817. To help assist in my testimony at trial, I have prepared a number of demonstratives  
2 that are attached hereto as **Exhibit Q**. These demonstratives are exemplary and I reserve the right  
3 to create additional demonstratives and/or to modify the demonstratives in **Exhibit Q** based on the  
4 material in this report. For example, I reserve the right to create additional demonstratives and/or  
5 to modify the demonstratives in **Exhibit Q** based on the testing screenshots I included in this report  
6 as well as the evidence cited in this report. I also reserve the right to rely on the demonstratives  
7 that were attached as Exhibit H to my Opening report regarding Asserted Claim 1 of the '885  
8 Patent dated June 22, 2022.

9           818. I have also reviewed Sonos's Technology Tutorial that provides an overview of the  
10 '885 Patent, which I understand was submitted to the court in February 2022. I incorporate by  
11 reference herein Sonos's Technology Tutorial and expressly reserve the right to use the  
12 Technology Tutorial in whole or in part as a demonstrative to assist in my testimony.

13 **XX. RESERVATION OF RIGHT**

14           819. I reserve the right to further expound on my opinions set forth herein in subsequent  
15 declarations, reports, and/or at trial.

16  
17  
18 Dated: November 30, 2022

By: Kevin C. Almeroth  
Kevin C. Almeroth